

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 17957-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/691,563

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected all pending claims 1-8 and 17-23. Specifically, claims 1-2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asano et al. (US 6,008, 582, hereafter as Asano), claims 22-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al. (US 2004/0017152, as Hashimoto) and claims 1-8 and 17-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto.

In response thereto, Applicants have further amended independent claims 1 and 17 and submitted the following remarks. Reconsideration of claims 1-8 and 17-23 is respectfully requested.

#### Discussion of Amendments to Claims 1 & 17

Claim 1/17 is amended with a word "*waved*" inserted in front of each "*strips*", the amendment being supported by, for example, FIG. 2.

It is believed that "*waved strips*" *constitutes no new issue needing further search*, at least for 1) the strips are originally intended to mean "*wave strips*" in this invention, as indicated by FIG. 2, and 2) "*sidewalls having a pattern comprising waved strips*" is equivalent to "*waved sidewalls*" that was present in original claims 1 & 17 and *had been searched by Examiner previously*, as indicated by the Non-Final Rejection of 11/15/2005 stating that the pixel-defining layer of Asano's electrode substrate has *waved sidewalls*.

#### Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 102(e)

Claims 1-2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 17957-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/691,563

Asano, and claims 22-23 rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto.

One feature of independent claims 1 and 17 is that at least one sidewall of the pixel-defining layer has a pattern comprising waved strips configured substantially parallel with the substrate.

Asano fails to disclose the above feature. The waved strips in FIG. 12 of Asano are almost perpendicular to, rather than parallel with, the substrate. The linear surfaces 65a, 65b and 65c in FIG. 13 of Asano, which was particularly mentioned by Examiner in the Office Action, may be called "*strips*", *but absolutely cannot be called "waved strips"* for there is no wave crest or wave trough in the combined structure of 65a, 65b and 65c.

One feature of claims 22 and 23 is that at least one sidewall of the pixel-defining layer has a pattern comprising a plurality of dot protrusions irregularly distributed thereon.

Hashimoto fails to disclose the above feature of claim 22/23. Examiner asserted, in Page 3 of this Office Action, that the paragraph [0036] of Hashimoto discloses the above feature. However, Applicants respectfully point out that according to the words in [0036] of Hashimoto and FIG. 7C, the dot protrusions (irregularities 9) are irregularly distributed on the surface of the substrate 1 but not on the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer 10. The corresponding key points of paragraph [0036] are particularly shown as follows.

*"[0036] ..... Referring to FIG. 7C, sandblasting is repeated two times by using abrasive particles such as alumina particles that have different sizes between the first blasting and the second blasting to chip off the surface of the substrate 1 other than portions below the dry filmstrips 12 ..... Thereby, barriers 10 and irregularities 9 for light scattering are simultaneously formed on the substrate 1 ..... The sides of each barrier 10 are gently*

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 17957-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/691,563

*tapered to ..... The shape of the taper can be determined by controlling the size of the sandblasting particles."*

In addition, according to [0036], the sandblasting conducted in Hashimoto merely determines the shape and the taper of the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer, *but does not cause irregularities to form on the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer.*

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 17 and 22-23 patently define the prior art.

For at least the same reasons mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 5 dependent from claim 1 also patently define over the prior art.

#### **Discussion of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1-8 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto.

As mentioned above, one feature of independent claim 1/17 is that at least one sidewall of the pixel-defining layer has a pattern comprising waved strips configured substantially parallel with the substrate.

Examiner asserted, in Page 4 of Office Action, that Hashimoto forms irregularities on the barriers to minimize internal attenuation of light, and that forming irregularities in the form of strips, instead of convex type irregularities, would have been obvious matter of design choice that could be resulted by experimentation for minimizing the internal attenuation of light.

However, as mentioned above, the irregularities in Hashimoto are actually on the substrate surface *but not on the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer.* Meanwhile,

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 17957-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/691,563

irregularities or waved strips on the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer *have no effect in minimizing the internal attenuation of light*. Hence, it is no obvious matter of design choice to form irregularities or waved strips *on the sidewalls of the pixel-defining layer* based on Hashimoto's teaching that forming irregularities *on the surface of the substrate* can minimize the internal attenuation of light.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 17 patently define the prior art.

For at least the same reasons mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 and 18-21 respectively dependent from independent claims 1 and 17 also patently define over the prior art.

Customer No.: 31561  
Docket No.: 17957-US-PA  
Application No.: 10/691,563

### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-8 and 17-23 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *June 26, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

*Belinda Lee*  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw)